



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## V.—CRITICAL NOTES ON NEW AND OLD GENERA OF PLANTS.

BY J. A. NIEUWLAND.

### RHAMNUS.

Some of the plants commonly included among the buckthorns had been even before Linnaeus put into a well recognized genus *Frangula*. Their generic standing had been adopted by writers as early as Cusa, Dodonaeus, Matthioli, Haller, C. Bauhin (Prod. 160, 1620), Tournefort, and by moderns as late as Asa Gray.<sup>1</sup> The characterizations by the latter author distinctive from the genus *Rhamnus* are sufficient to need no repetition here.

*FRANGULA* (Dodonaeus, Pempt., 6:2:25) Trew, Herb. Blackw. also Miller Gard. Dict., 8th Ed. (1768), Duhamel, Traite Arb. Arbustes I, 246 (1875), etc.

*Frangula Alnus* P. Miller, l. c.<sup>2</sup>

*Rhamnus Frangula* Linn., Sp. Pl., 193 (1753).

*Frangula caroliniana* Asa Gray, l. c.

*Rhamnus caroliniana* Walt., Fl. Car., 101 (1788).

The genus *Alaternus* might deserve consideration as a genus that may be separated from our aggregate *Rhamnus*. None of the plants are to be found in our region. *Cardiolepis* (*Endotropis*) Raf., Neog. 2, (1825) based on the *Rhamnus lanceolata* Pursh, Fl. Am. Sept., 166 (1814) has but two nutlets in fruit and the parts of the flower in 4's.

### APETLORHAMNUS, A NEW GENUS

The presence or absence of petals when a constant character would seem in itself to be a almost sufficient reason to segregate a plant or plant group in to a new genus. Many such lately proposed have not nearly as notable a reason for existence and are accepted by botanists without question. We have been anything but logical in our admission or non-admission of genera. In any ordinary key for the determination of plants the student is loath to find that he must look both among the Apetalae and the Choripetalae and even perhaps the Sympetalae to be able to find

<sup>1</sup> Gen. Pl. 177, vol. II (1849).

<sup>2</sup> This is the stupid duplicate binary *Frangula Frangula* according to the American codes.

plants of one genus! Such is in fact the case with the generally recognized genus *Fraxinus* of the manuals. About the only notable character that determines such a genus is the uniformity of the fruit. Apply such a principle or set of principles to the orchids and what chaos would result! The characters being considered as constant we can scarcely see that petaliferous and apetalous plants should be left in the same genus.

#### APETLORHAMNUS Nov. Gen.

Small shrub with branches thornless. Flowers pentamerous, solitary, or 2 to 3 in the axils coming out with the leaves. Petals none: fruit a subglobose drupe with three nutlets, each three grooved.

Arbuscula sine spinis in ramis, floribus cum partibus quinis; singulis vel paucis axillaribus foliis coactaneis: petalis nullis: fructu drupaceo cum nuculis tribus, canaliculatis.

The genus is quite distinctive by its apetalous flowers. Such an important character alone were enough to require its segregation, a character that can not be overlooked.

**Apetlorhamnus alnifolia** (L'Her.) Nwd.

*Rhamnus alnifolia* L'Her., Sert. Angl., 5 (1788).

#### LITANUM

*Talinum parviflorum* Nutt. differs considerably from the other members of the genus particularly by having only five stamens whereas the others have always at least twice as many. The presence or absence of a whole whorl of the floral organs is a very notable variation in flower structure and about as important as the presence or absence of petals or sepals. The capsule is quite different in shape and accordingly a difference in the placentation from the other plants of the group. This plant differs then as much if not more from its present congeners than does the newly made *Crunocallis* from the other Claytonias.

#### LITANUM Nov. Gen.

Planta perennis cum foliis teretis linearibus basi dilatatis: pedunculis tenuibus, floribus cymosis parvis, sepalis brevioribus ovatis, acutis: staminibus 5, vel paucioribus, stylo staminibus longiore: capsula elliptica.

**Litanum parviflorum** (Nutt.) Nwd.

*Talinum parviflorum* Nutt., T. and G., Fl. N.Am. I, 197 (1838).

## MUSCARI.

In the Illustrated Flora<sup>1</sup> Dr. Britton has permitted the name *Muscaria* Haw. for the genus of plants typified by *Saxifraga muscoides* Wulf. in spite of the fact that there is an older *Muscari* Miller<sup>2</sup> accepted in the same work. Surely if *Elodes* Adanson (1763)<sup>3</sup> in the same work renders the *Elodes* Michx. untenable then the *Muscaria* Haw. seems a perfect analogy. Both differ by exactly the same variations and a more exact case can scarcely be imagined. Unless one prefers to be dogmatic and arbitrary in matters of nomenclature, one can scarcely be looked upon as logical in accepting a name in one case and discarding another in a perfectly similar instance, and for reasons no bit the better or worse. It is probably better to look on the instance of the retention of *Muscaria* Haw. as an oversight that could not have come intentionally from a botanist as keen in matters of nomenclature as is the author of the Illustrated Flora.

That the names are identical is evident from the fact that the monocotyledonous plant name was corrected by Salisbury to *Moscharia*<sup>4</sup> which sounds quite the same in spite of its varied spelling; for it is the pronounced name that constituted the homonym. Though as far as we can find there has been no other name suggested for the *Saxifraga* segregate as a genus caption we suggest that of **Dactyloides** under which it first appeared as a section or subgenus.

*DACTYLOIDES* (Tausch) Nwd., Nom. Nov.

*Muscaria* Haw., Saxifr. Enum., 36 (1821), not *Muscari* P. Miller (1768) l. c. *Triplinervium* Sectio Gaudin, Fl. Helv., III, 116 (1828), *Dactyloides* Section Tausch, ex DC. Prod., IV. 23 (1830).

**Dactyloides muscoides** (Wulf).

*Saxifraga muscoides* Jacq., Coll. II, 123. *Muscaria muscoides* Haw. l. c.

**Dactyloides caespitosa.** (Linn.)

*Saxifraga caespitosa* (Linn.) Sp. Pl., 404 (1753)., *Muscaria caespitosa* Haw. l. c. 37.

<sup>1</sup> Britton, N. L., III. Flora, II, 222 (1913).

<sup>2</sup> l. c. I, 510 (P. Miller, Gard. Dict., 8th Ed. (1768).

<sup>3</sup> l. c. I, 104, II, 537.

<sup>4</sup> Salisbury, R., Gen. Pl. Frag., 25, (1866).

## HOUSTONIA SEGREGATES.

The group of plants aggregated with *Houstonia* and having flowers in typical cymes, and funnel shaped corollas have beside, a habit so different from the rest that they well deserve separate generic rank. Rafinesque as early as 1820<sup>1</sup> had suggested the division of the group into several subgenera, and it is one of his names which had actually been taken up by Steudel<sup>2</sup> and is here selected for the group. There is as great a difference between these plants and the typical *Houstonias* as between *Diodia teres*<sup>3</sup> and typical *Diodias* the former lately segregated as a genus. These latter can in fact be scarcely said to differ as much in habit.

**Chamisme** (Raf.) Nwd. Nov. Gen.

Plantae perennes aliquando suffruticosis ab *Houstonia* habitu distinctae, floribus dimorphicis purpureis vel lilacinis vel albis, corollis infundibuliformibus, cymis aggregatis. Alia ut in *Houstonia*.

Perennial plants sometimes suffruticose at the base with purplish flowers or pale. Corolla funnel shaped: flowers in leafless cymes terminal.

The perennial often suffruticose habit of these plants is a very notable distinctive character, showing very little resemblance to the tender vernal plants like *Houstonia coerulea* Linn. which is the type of *Houstonia* proper.

Type of the genus *Houstonia purpurea* Linn., Sp. El., 105 (1753)

**Chamisme purpurea** (Linn.) Nwd.

*Houstonia purpurea* Linn. l. c.

**Chamisme ciliolata** (Torr.) Nwd.

*Houstonia ciliolata* Torr., Fl. N. K. S. I., 183 (1824).

**Chamisme longifolia** (Gaertner) Nwd.

*Houstonia longifolia* Gaert., Fruct. I, 226, pl. 49, f. 8, (1788).

**Chamisme tenuifolia** (Nutt.) Nwd.

*Houstonia tenuifolia* Nutt., Gen., I, 95 (1818).

**Chamisme angustifolia** (Michx.) Nwd.

*Houstonia angustifolia* Michx. Fl. Bor. Am. I, 85 (1893),  
*Oldenlandia angustifolia* (Michx.) A. Gray, Pl. Wright. II, 60 (1853).

<sup>1</sup> Rafinesque, C. S., An. Gen. Sc. Phys., XV, 226, 227 (1820).

<sup>2</sup> Steudel, F. T., Nom. Bot., ed. III, 776 (1840).

<sup>3</sup> Small, J. K., Flora of Miami, 174, 175 (1913).

## PANETOS Raf.

*Houstonia rotundifolia* Michx.<sup>1</sup> has been segregated from *Houstonia* by Rafinesque under the name *Panetos*. Considering in addition to the characters given by that author also that of producing numerous cleistogamous flowers a rather unusual thing in this group the genus merits consideration for segregation.

**Panetos rotundifolius** (Michx.) Nwd.

*Houstonia rotundifolia* Michx., Fl. Bor. Am., I, 85 (1803).

There are other Mexican and southern members of the genus *Houstonia* that ought to be separated from this aggregate, having flower and habit characters even more notable than those here referred to.

## ARONIA MED. A HOMONYM.

On a number of occasions attention was called to the fact that several of Mitchell's names antedated others now commonly held. The publication of *Aronia*<sup>2</sup> by that author is earlier than that of Medicus<sup>3</sup> or Persoon.

The *Aronia* of Mitchell is *Orontium* of Linnaeus and though it can not be used as a valid name itself, its previous use renders any subsequent application of the name invalid, whether its first application is admissable or not, according to the rules of the codes. Even if it had a different meaning and origin in deviation it still is exactly identical in sound and spelling.<sup>4</sup> It is therefore impossible to quibble about the matter for this reason. I have been unable to find that any other name is available as an alternative application. Before the plant was admitted as segregated validly by some, a subgenus or section name was applied by Decandolle, and this may serve as a substitute for the *Aronia* antedated.

**ADENORACHIS** (DC) Nwd. Nom. Nov.

*Aronia* Medicus, Phil. Bot., 140 (1789), also Persoon, Syn. II, 39 (1807) not *Aronia* Mitchell, Diss., App. I, (1769) = *Orontium*

<sup>1</sup> Raf., An. Gen. Sc. Phys. 1. c.

<sup>2</sup> Mitchell, J., Diss. Brevis de Princ. Bot. et Zool., App. aliquot de Pl. Virg. Obs., Norimb., Imp. Wulfgangii and Schwarzkopffii MDCCLXIX. (See Pritzel No. 6975).

<sup>3</sup> Persoon, C. H., Syn. II, 39, (1807), Medicus, F. K., Phil. Bot. I, 140 (1789).

<sup>4</sup> N. L. Britton, III, Flora, II, 290 (1913), Kuntze, O., Rev. Gen. Pl., II, 720 (1891).

Linn. (1753) Sp. Pl. 324. *Adenorachis* DC. Prod. II, 637 (1825), as section or subgenus.

***Adenorachis arbutifolia*** (Linn.) Nwd.

*Aronia arbutifolia* (Linn.) Ell., Bot. S. Car. and Ga., I, 556 (1821), *Mespiuls arbutifolia* Linn., Sp. Pl. 478 (1753), *Pyrus arbutifolia* Linn. f. Suppl. 256 (1781).

***Adenorachis atropurpurea*** (Robinson) Nwd.

*Aronia arbutifolia* Britton, Man., 517 (1901), *Pyrus arbutifolia* var. *atropurpurea* Robinson, Rhodora, x, 33, (1908).

***Adenorachis melanocarpa*** (Michx.) Nwd.

*Mespilus arbutifolia* var. *melanocarpa* Michx., Fl. Bor. Am., I, 292 (1803) *Pyrus melanocarpa* Willd., Enum., 525 (1809).

#### KYLLINGA A HOMONYM.

The *Kyllinga* Rott.<sup>1</sup> is antedated by Adanson's *Killinga*<sup>2</sup> the latter a segregate from *Athamanta*. Though the name is slightly different in spelling it is nevertheless the same in sound and on the authority of Brevel<sup>3</sup> named after the same Peter Kylling a Danish Botanist. The next available name not only in order but with the same type as that of *Kyllinga* Rottb. itself is *Thryocephalon* Forst. The other names as given in the Kew Index may possibly be attempts at segregation anyhow. Following is the synonymy.

*THRYOCEPHALON* Forst., Char. Gen., 129, t. 65 (1776).

*Kyllinga* Rottb. l. c. (1773), not *Killinga* Adans. l. c. (1763) nor Brevel, l. c., (1770).

***Thryocephalon pumilum*** (Michx.) Nwd.

*Kyllinga pumila* Michx. Fl. Bor. Am., I, 28 (1803), *Hedychloe fragans* Raf., Ann. Nat., 16 (1820).

#### KOCHIA A HOMONYM.

*Kochia*<sup>4</sup> Roth, is a homonym because of the previous use of *Cocchia* (Mich.) Brevel,<sup>5</sup> (1770). The letters C and K are the same in Latin, and by all the systems of pronunciation the name

<sup>1</sup> Rottboel, C. F., Descr. Ic. 12, pl. 4, f. 3, 4, (1773).

<sup>2</sup> Adanson, M. Fam. des Pl., II, 498 (1763).

<sup>3</sup> Brevel, J. F. B., De Pl. Cult. Mem. Nom., 40 (1770) "*Killinga* Adans. *Athamanta cret. L.*"

<sup>4</sup> Roth, Schrader, Journ. Bot. I, 307, pl. 2 (1799).

<sup>5</sup> Brevel, J. F. B., De Pl. Cult. Mem., 28 (1770).

has the same sound. The latter name is applied as a proposed segregate with *Sideritis syriaca* Linn., as type. As we are unable to find that any other attempt has been made to name them Chenopodiaceous plant all in the Kew Index being apparently proposed segregates that might at any time be reserved for their proper groups if raised to generic standing it is necessary to give a new one, for which **Bushiola** is proposed herewith.

*BUSHIOLA* Nwd. Nom. Nov.

*Kochia* Roth l. c. (1799) not *Cocchia* Brevel, l. c. (1770).

**Bushiola Scoparia** (Linn.) Nwd.

*Kochia Scoparia* (Linn.) Roth. Neues Jour. Bot., III, 85, (1809), *Chenopodium Scoparia* Linn., Sp. Pl., 221 (1753).

---

### PROPER PUBLICATION.

---

That any code putting restrictions for expediency on "starting points" arbitrarily chosen for beginning nomenclature, contains within itself its germs of destruction, will some day be conclusively admitted, as better knowledge and far-sighted logic throw more light on these problems. Nevertheless in matters of plant names we fail to see that a logical structure can not be built on a faulty foundation without ending in chaos. Most of our latest codes and the American with them agree to accept 1753 as the beginning of nomenclature for botany. No generic descriptions having been made in Linnaeus' *Species Plantarum*, the generic names are to be accepted as to their validity for "proper" publication by reference to the *Genera Plantarum* of 1754 with a special provision of code to cover this specific instance. In the Vienna Code rules we are told that "the rules of nomenclature should be neither arbitrary nor imposed by authority," (Art. 3) and then it proceeds in the most high-handed and arbitrary manner to publish over 20 pages of *nomina conservanda* that *must* be retained; and this because the code makers can give no good reason why they should be. This is done, too, without any attempt at exciting our humorous feelings.

Already, much dogmatic and canonical teaching has gone forth as to what constitutes "proper publication." It is not sufficient that for a validity of a name we be quite certain as to its identity. Among these "canons" required in order that